



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/663,995

09/17/2003

Soon Jo Lee

9988.059.00-US

1979

30827

7590

11/06/2006

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,995	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Stephen Gravini	Art Unit 3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary matter

Examiner's immediate supervisor had instructed examination such that claims must not rely on imported description/specification in an internal Office electronic mail messages to the examiner dated August 8, 2006 and August 2, 2006. Claims must contain all specification discussion as clarified by the supervisor. Furthermore, language such as "configured for shielding" or "wall configured for" is to be interpreted as desired result and ordered examination such that the invention should be claimed as means or step plus function format, based on an internal Office electronic mail message dated July 10, 2006. The rejections to follow are based on mandated policies by the supervisor, with contact information at the end of this action.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 4-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Douty et al. (EP 0 889 556). Douty is considered to disclose the claimed invention comprising:

a terminal block **10** disposed within the laundry dryer control panel, the terminal block including a back portion placed on a control panel **150** and a front portion **168** having a lower part and an uppermost part;

a wall **20**, **22**, or **26** extending below the terminal block bottom part and above the terminal block uppermost part;

a first wire **192** extending out of the terminal block bottom part; and
a second wire **186** extending out of the terminal block uppermost part wherein the wall extends from the terminal block such that the wall shields an exposed portion of the first wire and the second wire. Douty is also considered to disclose the claimed feature wherein the wall covers a first connector coupling the terminal block lower part with a first power wire and a second connector coupling the terminal block upper part with a second power wire from a first side of the terminal block and a second side of the terminal block as shown in figure 6, single body terminal block formation as shown in figure 1, first and second part spacing as shown in figures 4 & 5, and wall size extension as shown in figures 1-6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick (US 2,742,708) in view of Lennon et al. (US 4,030,802). McCormick is considered to disclose the claimed invention comprising:

base **314** forming a floor;
a front cabinet **211** forming a front portion of the clothes dryer;
a side cabinet **218** forming a side portion of the clothes dryer;
a back cover **214** forming a back side of the clothes dryer
a top cover **216** provided on a top surface of the front cabinet, the side cabinet and the back cover;
a control panel **217** provided on a rear portion of the top cover. McCormick is considered to disclose the claimed invention except for the claimed terminal block

provided on an inside of the control panel, wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall configured for shielding part exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion, first and second part spacing, and wall size extension. Lennon, another structure for a clothes dryer, is considered to disclose a terminal block provided on an inside of the control panel, wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall configured for shielding part exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion at column 4 line 42 through column 9 line 11 first and second part spacing as shown in figures 4 & 5, and wall size extension as shown in figures 1-6. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of McCormick with the terminal block provided on an inside of the control panel, wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall configured for shielding part exposing a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion, considered disclosed in Lennon, for the purpose of improved mounting characteristics within a multiple connector assembly.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Hopkins in further view of Sergeant et al. (US 4,820,189). McCormick in view of Hopkins is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above under the obviousness rejection, except for the claimed wall for

Art Unit: 3749

shielding an exposed part of core wire covers a first connector connecting a lower part of the terminal block with a power cord wire and a second connector connecting an upper part of the terminal block with a power cord wire from a front portion of the terminal block and a side portion of the terminal block. Sergeant, another structure for a clothes dryer, is considered to disclose a wall for shielding an exposed part of core wire covers a first connector connecting a lower part of the terminal block with a power cord wire and a second connector connecting an upper part of the terminal block with a power cord wire from a front portion of the terminal block and a side portion of the terminal block at column 4 lines 1-12, first and second part spacing as shown in figures 2, 3 & 5, and wall size extension as shown in figures 2, 3 & 5. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of McCormick in view of Hopkins with the wall for shielding an exposed part of core wire covers a first connector connecting a lower part of the terminal block with a power cord wire and a second connector connecting an upper part of the terminal block with a power cord wire from a front portion of the terminal block and a side portion of the terminal block, first and second part spacing, and wall size extension, considered disclosed in Sergeant, for the purpose of shielding a covered power cord wire.

Response to Arguments

anticipation

Applicants' alleges primary reference Douty does not anticipate the claimed invention because portions of "exposed cores" and wall "configured for shielding an exposed part of a core of a wire extending above an uppermost portion of the front

portion and below a bottom portion of the front portion" is not seen from that reference. Current Office practice guides examination such that claims are to be reasonably and broadly construed from the accompanying specification. In this application, applicants claim:

“a wall extending below the terminal block bottom part and above the terminal block uppermost part;

a first wire extending out of the terminal block bottom part; and

a second wire extending out of the terminal block uppermost part wherein the wall extends from the terminal block such that the wall shields portions of exposed cores of the first wire and second wire.” From the specification pre-grant publication US 2004/0221478 paragraphs [0011], [0024], and [0027], the claimed “exposed cores” is reasonably and broadly construed to be a portion of the wire which would cause an accident to a worker when contacted. Also the claimed “wall shields” is reasonably and broadly construed to be a “height enough such that workers are prevented from contacting the exposed part of the wire with a body part such as a hand” from paragraph [0025]. Looking to figures 1, 4, 5, and 6 of Douthy, it can be seen that termination site **20**, periphery **16**, or skirt **22** all meet the claimed wall shielding limitations with respect to a first wire **192** and a second wire **186**. The terminals, internal wires, and ring tongue sections argued by the applicants anticipate the claimed exposed cores because those portions are used to expose wire cores to electrically connect first and second wires. The rejection of claims 4-6 is considered proper and therefore maintained.

obviousness

Applicants argue that Lennon does not obviate the teachings of McCormick because the claimed wall configurations are not seen from that reference. Examiner is not guided by current Office practice to give a narrower meaning to claim language that argued. The independently claimed recitation "configured for" is considered to be met in Lennon because it can be seen from figures 2, 3, and 5 that the wall is configured for the intended use as claimed. The first obviousness rejections of claims 1 and 3 is considered proper and therefore maintained.

Again applicants argue the second obviousness rejection is improper because the desired result or intended use is not seen for secondary reference Lennon. As discussed above, the independently claimed recitation "configured for" is considered to be met in Lennon because it can be seen from figures 2, 3, and 5 that the wall is configured for the intended use as claimed. The second obviousness rejections of claims 1 and 3 is considered proper and therefore maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMG
October 13, 2006

Stephen Gravini